

EDUVELOP

Journal of English Education and Development

Volume 2, No. 1, September 2018

ISSN 2597-713X (print)
ISSN 2597-7148 (online)

Peer Feedback Technique in Teaching Writing Skill of the Third Semester Students of IAIN Parepare

Magdahalena Tjalla

Institut Agama Islam Negeri Parepare
Address. Amal Bakti No. 8, Soreang, Kota Parepare

Rasmah

Universitas Muhammadiyah Parepare
Address Jend. Ahmad Yani No.Km. 6, Bukit Harapan, Soreang, Kota Pare-Pare, Sulawesi Selatan 91112

Abstract: Writing is still considered as a difficult skill in language learning by Indonesian students. For that reason, it is urgent for teacher to seek for interesting ways to teach writing in the classroom. This study examines the effectiveness of the use of peer feedback technique to improve students' skill in writing descriptive paragraph. Some studies have proved the effectiveness of the technique to improve students' writing skill. The study employs experimental research in which one class of 20 students is taught to write narrative paragraph and correct their paragraph using peer feedback technique. The result of the study shows that the technique improves the students writing skill in narrative writing, however the scores are not significant. This suggests that there is a factor that affects the result of the teaching using peer feedback, and it is the less time of treatment which is indicated as the factor.

Keyword: *Peer Feedback, Writing Skill, Technique*

1. Introduction

Writing is one way to develop our opinions, ideas, or thought. Many people can't develop their idea orally but they can express their idea through writing. In academic context, writing skill is one of important skills to learn for completing academic tasks. Writing is a combination of process and product of discovering ideas, putting them on paper and working with them until they are presented in manner that is polished and comprehensible to readers (Linse, 2006).

Some experts compare the complexity of writing skill to other productive language skill, speaking. Harmer (2004) argues that writing skill has to go through a process of conscious learning problem happens while spoken language is acquired naturally by exposure. Moreover, Byrne (1990) explains the difficulty of learning to write compare to speaking in three aspects: psychological, linguistic, and cognitive. Firstly, the fact that writing is a solitary activity with the absence of interaction and

13

Volume 2, No. 1, September 2018

EDUVELOP
Journal of English Education and Development
Universitas Sulawesi Barat

feedback makes writing difficult for students psychologically. Moreover, the lack of some features which are always found in speaking such as spontaneity, little time to sentence connection and organization also makes writing difficult. Finally, writing and speaking are different cognitively. The fact that we are accustomed spontaneously to speak without much conscious effort makes writing, which has to be learned through a process of instruction with many difficult rules for EFL students. Indonesian students still experience writing skill as a difficult skill compared to other skill in language learning and one of the technique that can be used in teaching writing is stories technique (Syamsiah 2017)

Obviously, writing process is one factor that makes writing a complex skill. Writing has to go through a process which involves three stages: prewriting, writing, and revising (Brown, *et al.*, 1984). In prewriting, students have to do three things: thinking, planning, and preparing to give them an opportunity to collect ideas to write. In this stage, they should also identify their purpose of writing, audience to whom their writing are directed, and the topic of the writing. After finishing this stage, they can develop their ideas in a piece of writing by considering the purpose of writing as well as the audience to whom his/her writing is directed. Revising is done when a writer has finished the first draft of his/her writing by reorganizing and rewriting. The final step of the revising stages is proofreading. In this stage, all errors in grammar, usage, spelling, capitalization, and punctuation are checking carefully. The process will come to the end if all the stages have been done.

Considering the complexity of writing skill, the teaching of writing then is a challenging work. A good teacher has to employ appropriate techniques to engage

students' motivation in writing. One technique offered in this study is peer feedback. Churchill (2011) states that feedback is the foundation to any learning. It allows a student to progress and improve their learning. In writing, peer feedback is a technique that is used by students to correct on their peers writing composition.

Peer feedback is helpful to provide students more opportunities to learn from each other. After students finish a writing assignment, the teacher has two or more than two students work together to check each other's work and give comments to the peer partner. Peer feedback can be in the form of corrections, opinions, suggestions, ideas to each other. After finishing the writing, the peer will read over, correct, and make some changes. Peer feedback is a two-way process in which one cooperates with the other.

Considering the complexity of writing, this study is conducted to find the effectiveness of peer feedback in improving the writing skill of English Department students of STAIN Parepare. This study is expected to answer the following research question: "Is the Peer feedback technique able to improve students' teaching writing skill of the third semester students of STAIN Parepare?"

The research is expected to have both theoretical and practical contribution. Theoretically, this research can help the teacher to find out the alternative way of technique in post writing use peer feedback technique. Practically, it can be used as a technique to improve the students' writing skill, the students are expected to be able to good progress in writing ability. (Patak et al. 2013)

A. The Process of Writing

Writing takes a process. This differentiate writing to speaking, which is known with spontaneous characteristic. Students' writing assignments should go

through the stages of drafting and receiving feedback and revision.

O'Donnell and Paiva (1993) explain the process of writing into several stages: thinking, planning, writing, revising, and editing. In thinking stage, a writer may do several strategies, such as discuss the topic with friends, takes notes the ideas comes in mind, or keep the idea in mind. In planning stage, a writer can make outline of the ideas. The ideas are arranged in order and the outline will be followed by the writer when he starts writing his text. Some writers write the ideas come in their mind to help them generate /produce/find out new ideas. They think while they write, and makes plan later. The next stage of writing is revising. In this stage, the writer looks back the text that has been written and ask some questions related to the content of the text. Editing, means find out the errors in writing, such as spelling, punctuation, etc.

The process of writing can be describe as a spiral process (O'Donnell and Paiva, 1993). It consists of a series of flexible activities in which a writer may start with writing or thinking, and plan before or while writing. A writer may do each stage many times, until he arrive at the final product of the text. It is also a recursive activity in which the writer may need to go through the stages more than once. The writer sometimes needs to go back to the process that we have done until he can produce a finished composition.

Brown, *et al.*, (1984) divides the process of writing into three stages: prewriting, writing, and revising. In prewriting, writers do three things: thinking, planning, and preparing. This stage is done to give a writer an opportunity to collect ideas to write. In this stage, a writer also identifies his/her purpose of writing, audience to whom his/her writing is directed, and the topic of

the writing. After finishing this stage, a writer can develop his/her ideas in a piece of writing by considering the purpose of writing as well as the audience to whom his/her writing is directed. Revising is done when a writer has finished the first draft of his/her writing by reorganizing and rewriting. The final step of the revising stages is proofreading. In this stage, all errors in grammar, usage, spelling, capitalization, and punctuation are checking carefully. The process will come to the end if all the stages have been done.

B. Narrative Text

Narrative writing is a kind of writing that tells a story. It is written to entertain and engage readers in an imaginative experience. For that purposes, this writing allows students to express themselves in a creative ways. Narrative writing has some elements which build the story of a narrative: introduction, plot, characters, setting, climax, and conclusion (Baker, et al., 2014). Furthermore, narrative writing is also identified by the use of descriptive language and past tense.

C. Peer Feedback Technique

Peer feedback is a practice in language education where feedback is given by a student to another. In writing classes, peer feedback is used to provide students more opportunities to learn from each other. After students finish a writing assignment, the teacher has two or more than two students work together to check each other's work and give comments to the peer partner.

Feedback is seen according to two dimensions, namely, evaluative feedback and corrective feedback. Evaluative feedback includes praise and criticism, whereas corrective feedback is concerned with the rightness/wrongness view of marking and responding, or the degree to which the given responses are adequate. Corrective feedback is a frequent practice

in the field of education and in learning generally. It typically involves a students receiving either formal or informal feedback on his or her performance on various tasks by a teacher or peer (Barry, 1993).

Some studies have proved the effectiveness of peer feedback to improve students' writing skill. Peer feedback is a worthwhile experience; it offered an opportunity for social interaction. It also improves students' writing skills. Furthermore, it enhances students' critical thinking, confidence, creativity, and motivation. In addition, it helps in improving students' assignments (Farrah, 2012). Likewise, giving and receiving peer feedback enhances the students' writing quality, especially in content and organization, improves their critical thinking and establishes a better rapport between them (Zeqiri, 2011).

3. Method

The research used pre-experimental method. The research applied only one class as experimental class. The formula is presented as follows:

$$O_1 \quad X \quad O_2$$

Where:

P: Rate Percentage

F : Frequency of the Correct Answer

N: The Total Number of Students

4. Findings and Discussions

The research used pretest and posttest scores as the data to know the effectiveness of peer feedback technique to improve students' writing skill in writing narrative test. The students' scores included the highest, the lowest, the mean, the median, and the modus scores. The scores were shown in the following table.

Table 3: The Students' Scores

Num	Category	Pre-test	Post-test
1.	Highest	73	94

2.	Lowest	53	67
3.	Mean	63.65	78
4.	Median	66	77
5.	Modus	66	77

The table showed that the scores were greater in posttest than in pretest. The highest was 94 in post test and 73 in pretest, the lowest was 67 in posttest and 53 in pretest, the mean score was 78 in posttest and 63.65 in pretest, the median was 77 in posttest and 66 in pretest as well as modus was 77 in posttest and 66 in pretest.

After being calculated, the percentage of the students' scores in pretest and post-test were got. The scores were then classified into excellent, good, fair and very poor as shown in the following table.

Table 4: The Result of Students' Score

Num	Classification	Score	Pre-test		Post-test	
			F	%	F	%
1	Excellent	86-100	-	-	4	20
2	Good	61-85	14	70	16	80
3	Fair	47-60	6	30	-	-
4	Very Poor	0-46	-	-	-	-
Total			20		20	

The table shows that in pretest, none students got excellent. There were 14 students (70%) got good score, 6 students (30%) got fair, and none students got very poor score. The table above also shows that in posttest, there were 4 students (20%) got excellent score and 16 students (80%) got good score. The table shows that scores in posttest were higher than in pre-test but there were no significant differences between the result of the students' scores.

The students' scores in posttest consists of score in three components of writing: vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. The following table shows the students' scores in the writing components:

Table 5: Percentage Score of Students in Vocabulary

Num	Classification	Score	Vocabulary	
			F	%
1.	Excellent	40-38	14	70
2.	Good	34-31	6	30
3.	Fair	22-19	-	-
4.	Very Poor	18-16	-	-
Total			20	100

The table shows the percentage of students' score of vocabulary in experimental class of post-test. 14 of 20 students (70%) got excellent and 6 of the students (30%) got good score. None students got fair and very poor score.

Table 6: Percentage Score of Students in Language Use

Numb.	Classification	Score	Language Use	
			F	%
1.	Excellent	50-47	1	5
2.	Good	42-39	6	30
3.	Fair	30-24	13	65
4.	Very Poor	21-16	-	-
Total			20	100

The table showed that 1 of the students student (5%) got excellent, 6 of the students (30%) got good and 13 of the students (65%) got fair score. None students got very poor score.

Table 8: The significant Score of the Students in Writing Components

Num	Components	N	Level of Significant	t-test	t-table	classification
1	vocabulary	20	0.05	0.107	2.093	No significant
2	Language use	20	0.05	0.127	-	No significant
3	mechanics	20	0.05	1.453	-	No significant

The table of significant score of writing components shows that in vocabulary, the t-table (2.093) is greater

Table 7: Percentage Score of Students in Mechanics

Num.	Classification	Score	Mechanics	
			F	%
1.	Excellent	10	-	-
2.	Good	9	8	40
3.	Fair	8	12	60
4.	Very Poor	7	-	-
Total			20	100

The table shows that none students got excellent, 8 of the students (40%) got good and 12 of the students students (60%) got fair score. None student got very poor score.

It is found that the level of significance of T-table $\alpha = 0.05$ and $df = 19$, therefore, the value of the T-table is 2.093. Then the value of t-test is 0.059. Because the t- Table was greater than the t-Test ($2.093 < 0.059$), therefore H_0 is accepted, and H_a is rejected. It means that It means that there was no significance different of the use of peer feedback in teaching writing skill for the students in experimental class.

The research also shows the significant scores of the students in writing components. The components included the vocabulary, language use and mechanics. The score was presented in the following table.

than t-test (0.107), it means that score in vocabulary is not significant, in language use the t-table (2.093) is greater than t-test (0.127), it means that the score in language

use is not significant, and mechanics the t-table (2.093) is greater than t-test (1.453), it also means that score is language use is not significant.

The discussions deal with the interpretation of the findings derived from the result of statistical analysis of the tests. The tables in the previous part illustrated that the use of peer feedback technique for teaching narrative paragraph text can improve the students' writing skill but the improvement is not significant. It can be concluded that the students already had good skill in writing which enables them to write narrative text with appropriate vocabulary, language use, and grammar.

The conclusion is take from the students' progress in the three writing components: vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. Like other writing types, student needs good knowledge of vocabulary as well as language use and mechanics in

order to be able to produce good text. The students' who got good classification in pre-test proved that they have good writing skills. It was shown in the findings section,

That the students' percentage score in the pretest is good but 30% of them were in fair classification in the posttest. Based on the description of the data, it is revealed that the researcher's observation indicated that the students' writing skill was good before giving treatment.

Some of of the students got fair classification in writing skills. Some factors were indicated as the causes, namely:

- a. The students' low competence in vocabularies and grammar. The mains reasons why the students were still difficult to understand their English textbook because they still lack of vocabularies and it made them hard to express their ideas in English text. The students' low competence of grammar were also the source of their problem.

They were confused in writing a good because they are afraid of making ungrammatical text.

- b. The students' lack of motivation in learning English. The students who have low motivation in learning were bored and did not do their best in classroom.
- c. The students' lack of practice. Some of the students knew about English but they were lack of practice. They need to write every day to build their writing fluency.

Those problems faced by the students had been overcome by teaching writing skill by using peer feedback technique. The students gave feedback to their friends. They worked together to check each others' work and gave comments to the peer partner. This is proved by the percentage of the students' result scores of in posttest which were higher than in the pretest. There were 4 students (20%) got excellent score and 16 students (80%) got good score.

The students shows their enthusiasm to do writing activities in every meeting. In the first meeting the students chose one of the given topics to write (Vacation, Studying and Working) and chose flash cards of key words before starting to write, and they made good text.

The students also showed their high participation during the treatment. At the second meeting, the researcher gave some topics to write in narrative paragraph. They gave feedback to another student by answering editing checklist and paragraph checklist.

After calculating the students' result in components of writing in post-test. The component of vocabulary had the highest score was 38, the lowest was 31, the mean score was 36.2, the median was 38 and the modus was 38. While the language use had the highest score was 47, the lowest was 27, the mean score was 33.4, the median was 30 as well as the modus was 30 and the

mechanics had the highest score was 9, the lowest was 8, the mean score was 8.4, the median was 8 as well as the modus was 8.

Even though most of the students showed great attention and curiosity during the treatment, the result of the study showed no significant difference in the students score. Their score in posttest shows improvement, however the score is not significant. One of the probable reasons was the less time of the treatment. The present study conducted the treatment in only two meetings, it might affect the result of the study. Treatment should be more than two meetings to get the best result as the previous of studies have proved the effectiveness of using peer feedback in writing classrooms (Zekiri, 2011; Farrah, 2012).

5. Conclusion

As indicated in the findings of the study, it was found that the use of the peer feedback technique improved the students' writing skill in narrative paragraph text, however the score of the improvement is not significant. It was proved from the result of the total score of pre-test was 63.65 (good) and the total score of post-test 78 (good). The less time of treatment is indicated as the factor that affects the result of the study.

References

- Farrah, Muhammad. 2012. "The Impact of peer Feedback on Improving the Writing Skill:Herbon University, Palestine" Vol.26, No.1.
- Baker, Jack, *et al.* Welcome to the Purdue OWL. (Online),
(<http://owl.english.purdue.edu/>, Retrieved on January 27, 2015).
- Barry, Kevin. 1993. *Beginning Teaching*. Australia: Social Science Press.
- Brown, *et al.* 1984. *Grammar and Composition*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Byrne, Donn. 1984. *English Teaching Perspective*. London: Longman.
- Churchill, Rick. 2011. *Teaching: Making a Difference*. Australia: Cataloguing
- Patak, Andi Anto, Hamimah Abu Naim, Hasbullah Said, and Nur Asik. 2013. "Conceptualizing Assessment of Final Project Writing in English as a Foreign Language (EFL): An Indonesian Context." In *Proceedings of Technology, Education, and Science International Conference (TESIC) 2013: Developing Innovative Technology towards Better Human Life*, 33. Ibnu Sina Institute for Fundamental Science Studies, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia.
- Syamsiah, Syamsiah. 2017. "The Effect of the Use of Stories in Improving the Writing Ability of the Second Year Students of Madrasah Tsanawiyah Negeri Mangempang Barru." *EDUVELOP (Journal of English Education and Development)* 1 (1): 57–66.
<https://doi.org/10.31605/eduvelop.v1i1.5>.